

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. In this Amendment, claims 1, 8 and 14 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections in view of the following remarks.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,477,570 (hereinafter "Takayama"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to recite that if it is judged that said job cannot be processed in step 3), accepting at least one of a user's instruction to change the processing condition and a user's instruction to compulsorily execute the job according to the processing condition before transmitting said job to the job processing device. Support for the amended features can be found at least in paragraphs 0058-0063 of the specification.

The above recited features of claim 1 are not taught or suggested in Takayama. Takayama discloses that an apparatus designated to perform the processing determines whether it or another apparatus should perform the processing, and as a result of the determination, either performs the processing itself or sends an instruction to another apparatus to perform the processing. Col. 13, lines 45-51. Referring to FIG. 15 of Takayama, at step S161, a designated apparatus, if unable to perform the processing itself, determines whether another

apparatus can perform the processing. If there is an optimal apparatus other than the designated apparatus that has capabilities consonant with the object of the job, program control goes from step S160 to step S161, whereat it is determined that the other apparatus will perform the job, and at step S162 the designated apparatus sends a job execution instruction to the apparatus having capabilities consonant with the object of the job. Col. 13, line 62 – col. 14, line 8. At step S163, the designated apparatus notifies a user that another apparatus has executed the job. Col. 14, lines 8-10. If there is no apparatus having capabilities consonant with the object of the job, program control moves from step S160 to step S164, whereat planning is begun to prepare an optimal method for performing the printing, which is the object of the job for the output of information. Col. 15, lines 41-46. At step S165, the plan is proposed to a user. Col. 15, lines 40-53. As a result, it is determined that the optimal method involves the return of a printing apparatus to its normal operating status and at step S165, the proposed method, whereby either the printer 104, which is out of toner, or the printer 103, which is out of paper, is to be recovered to the printing enabled state, is presented in a window shown in FIG. 17 for approval by the user. Col. 15, lines 46-53.

According to Takayama, if the designated apparatus does not have capabilities consonant with the object of the job, it will search for another apparatus that can perform the processing. If there is an apparatus other than the designated apparatus that has capabilities consonant with the object of the job, the other apparatus will perform the processing. If there is no apparatus that has capabilities consonant with the object of the job, the user will be notified. Nowhere does Takayama disclose a user's instruction to change the object of the job or a user's

instruction to compulsorily execute the job according to the object of the job before the transmitting of the job to an apparatus. Therefore, Takayama does not teach or suggest that that if it is judged that said job cannot be processed in step 3), accepting at least one of a user's instruction to change the processing condition and a user's instruction to compulsorily execute the job according to the processing condition before transmitting said job to the job processing device, as recited in claim 1.

At least for the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable. Claims 8 and 14 are patentable because they include distinctive features analogous to these of claim 1. The remaining claims are patentable at least because of their dependencies.

Conclusion

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below if any issues remain in this matter, or if a discussion regarding any portion of the application is desired by the Examiner.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time.

The fees for such extension of time may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge
our Deposit Account No. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: March 9, 2009

By: Weiwei Y. Stiltner
Weiwei Y. Stiltner
Registration No. 62,979

Customer No. 21839
P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620